arXiv:1408.4753v1 [cs.CL] 20 Aug 2014

Be Careful When Assuming the Obvious: Commentary on "The placement of the head that minimizes online memory: a complex systems approach"

Phillip M. Alday

August 21, 2014

Abstract

Ferrer-i-Cancho (in press) presents a mathematical model of both the synchronic and diachronic nature of word order based on the assumption that memory costs are a never decreasing function of distance and a few very general linguistic assumptions. However, even these minimal and seemingly obvious assumptions are not as safe as they appear in light of recent typological and psycholinguistic evidence. The interaction of word order and memory has further depths to be explored.

Keywords: word order; head placement; language dynamics; memory and language

Sprachwissenschaft? Gauß wiegte den Kopf. Das sei etwas für Leute, welche die Pedanterie zur Mathematik hätten, nicht jedoch die Intelligenz. Leute, die sich ihre eigene notdürftige Logik erfänden. (Kehlmann 2007, 169)[1]

Linguistics, especially in its more cognitively oriented forms, has an uneasy relationship with mathematics. Many of the formalisms used since the Chomskyan revolution — trees, transformations, aspects of combinatorics, etc. — are clearly mathematical in nature, yet their use in linguistics is decidedly less rigorous than their use in the computational sciences, e.g. the study of automata. These parallels are perhaps responsible for the disturbing trend to move further away from data towards an idealized platonic world of language. Worse, the lack of rigor means that the theories have become increasingly baroque, yet still unable to explain core phenomena. Ferrer-i-Cancho (in press) shows the weakness of this approach by addressing a long-standing curiosity of linguistic typology,

[1] Haider (2009) provides a good translation of the fictional dialog between Gauss and Humboldt: "Linguistics? This is something for people with the pedantry, but not the intelligence, for mathematics. People who invent their own scanty logics."

namely the preference for certain word order configurations both synchronically and diacronically, with an elegant and theory-agnostic approach. But just as the obvious truths of Euclidean geometry require some further consideration in our decidedly non-Euclidean universe, Ferrer-i-Cancho's axioms must be considered carefully in light of the complexity of memory and language.

Ferrer-i-Cancho's approach is remarkable for a number of reasons. In terms of linguistic theory, the primary assumption is that there is something like a head-dependent relationship in a very broad form — so broad indeed that the definition would apply equally well to both phrase-structure and dependency grammars. While the algebra involved is occasionally tedious, the proofs do not use any particularly advanced machinery.[2]

The assumptions regarding memory are also relatively simple: the more intervening elements between a head and its dependents, the higher the memory cost; more specifically, the cost always increases with each additional element. For simplicity's sake, Ferrer-i-Cancho also assumes that the relationship is fully symmetric — it does not matter if the dependent comes before the head or vice versa. Other typological features — morphological alignment, synthetic vs. analytic — are not impacted by this generality, and this is a strength. Ferrer-i-Cancho does not remark upon this, but the difficulties in defining terms like "subject" from a cross-linguistic perspective are not a problem here — although the labels "S" and "O" are used, the results hold for the arguments of any transitive relationship, regardless of how agreement and case-marking work in the language in question.[3] Moreover, although Ferrer-i-Cancho focuses on the configuration of S, V and O, his core assumptions would also be valid for any configuration involving a head and two dependents. This would explain, for example, why conjunctions often appear between conjoined elements, although e.g. a suffix on the second element (cf. Latin *-que*) would also be possible. The generality and power of this result follow directly from the minimal assumptions.

However, this generality presents a problem in and of itself. The stability of head-central placement should also hold for other head types, yet there are no languages which place half of the adjectives before the head noun and the other half after it. (And if morphology uses the same machinery as syntax, then the relative rarity of infixes compared to prefixes and suffixes would also pose a problem.) Perhaps this can be explained by the optionality of further dependents. If nouns most commonly occur with only one or no modifier, then

[2] I think Ferrer-i-Cancho would agree with me that the fear of equations even at the level in his paper is one of the bigger problems in moving the study of language away from its metaphysical beginnings towards a more empirical study. Haider (2009) seems also to follow this spirit, in discussing the necessity of moving from very-well described data to (mathematical) characterization of that data (basic models expressing the nature of certain relationships,e.g. *laws* in the physical sciences) and further to explanations of those relationships which make predictions beyond the initial data. Ferrer-i-Cancho's contribution seems to be the first step in moving from description to prediction.

[3] Traditional grammatical notions of "subject" (tied to the nominative case, agreement and word order) quickly fall apart when we move beyond western Europe. Ergativity presents an obvious difficulty as does topic prominence, e.g. in Chinese (LaPolla 1993).

central placement would be a special case. (The lack of noun phrases with many modifiers is probably also related to certain aspects of online memory cost.) The simpler processing mechanism is then to pick left- or right-headedness and stick with it. In computational terms, special cases aren't special enough — the computational cost of a single mechanism is less than the memory cost incurred by not using special cases, when amortized over all sentences.

Ferrer-i-Cancho posits that the (anti-)symmetry of head placement in NPs compared to the verbal head at the sentence level may serve as a counterweight in preserving the stability of certain word order configurations. This explains why the central placement usually does not occur, but the question that remains is why there are *no* languages with central noun placement. Interestingly, in his derivation of this result, he also provides a more rigorous explanation for consistent headedness across phrase types — head-right for NPs (and, by extension, postpositions instead of prepositions) actually reduces the total dependency length summed over multiple structural levels for SOV word order, while there is no clear advantage for pre- nor postnominal modifiers in the symmetric world of SVO, which might explain the post-nominal adjective placement with *pre*positions observed in the Romance languages. (Indeed, the mixture of prepositions and post-nominal modifiers could be seen as an attempt to place the nominal head centrally.) The deeper yet unexplored implication here is an explanation for certain regularities in branching direction across phrase types that is much more satisfying — and better able to deal with certain irregularities — than the Chomskyan assumption of a single parameter for the relative placements of heads.

The three-element representation of word order is a simplification that struggles even with the Indoeuropean languages. Verb-second word order in the Germanic languages (cf. Mallinson and Blake 1981; Haider 2010) admits SVO and OVS as some of its possibilities; however, VSO and VOS can also appear under certain conditions. In subordinate clauses, the Germanic languages often show yet a different word order, and the subtleties are made even worse by the (asymmetric) verb-second property of German: in unmarked declarative clauses, the finite verb appears in the left periphery of the clause (the so-called "left sentence bracket", in terms of traditional grammatic description), preceded by a single constituent, whereas in canonical embedded clauses, it usually stays in final position ("right sentence bracket", Harbert 2007). (In both cases, the infinite part of the verb appears canonically in the right periphery.) In Italian, the presumed word order is SVO (Bates et al. 1982; cf. the entry for Italian in the World Atlas of Structures, Dryer and Haspelmath 2013), yet object pronouns appear as preverbal clitics and subject pronouns are often omitted. Full NP objects can appear initially and full NP subjects can appear post-verbally under certain information-structural conditions (Bianchi; cf. the behavioral data in Bates et al. 1982). Synchronic word order is unfortunately not as static as it appears. On the other hand, Ferrer-i-Cancho clearly states that he is modelling **only** the role of dependency length in determining word order and not any other factors. From a cognitive perspective, however, the question remains to

be answered whether memory costs are the decisive factor in determining an optimal word order.

In speaking about the optimality of the verbal encoding of language, we also need to consider that what is optimal for the speaker may not be optimal for the listener. Because the majority of research into the role of memory in language processing deals with language perception[4], and the notion of "open dependencies" seems to match up best with the notion of incremental processing during language perception, I will focus on some issues with the assumptions about memory with respect to perception. In psycholinguistics, Gibson formulated his Syntactic Prediction Locality Theory (SPLT, 1998) and its evolution, the Dependency Locality Theory (DLT, 2000), on the basis of empirical evidence that processing difficulty increased with the number of elements between dependent entities. Indeed, Ferrer-i-Cancho and Gibson make many of the same assumptions, although Gibson worked more with processing difficulty of individual sentences and less with typological trends. Gibson's theory is able to explain a great many effects reported in the psycholinguistic literature; however, anti-locality effects, where a more distant element is processed *more* quickly, present a difficult problem for such models (Konieczny 2000; Lewis, Vasishth, and Dyke 2006).

Recent models of short-term memory (cf. Jonides et al. 2008) posit a content-addressable system capable of direct access. More precisely, these models have feature-based indexing with some notion of rapid decay, corresponding to notions of "focus" in traditional memory models (which often divide memory into focus, short- and long-term memory). In such models, distance does play a role through an initially very rapid decay in activation followed by an asymptotic dwindling, but because of the rapid nature of the initial decay in activation, distance is generally not the dominating factor. Rather, the additional intervening elements often have overlapping features, which lead to interference, which increases memory costs. Because of the way activation is implemented in the mind / brain, having additional intervening elements does not cost more in and of itself, but rather increases the costs of retrieving any particular previous element (e.g. the head), potentially to the point of being unaffordable (i.e. forgetting). In terms of computation, we can think of dependency-length models as being like a search through an array (or even a stack, when we consider it in context of the classic Sternberg task), while newer feature-based models are comparable to hash-based lookup, where overlapping features lead to hash-collisions. Lewis and colleagues (Lewis and Vasishth 2005; Lewis, Vasishth, and Dyke 2006) applied this type of memory model to language processing and showed that it could explain the dependency-length effects in the literature *and* the anti-locality effects.

However, sequence-related information appears to be stored as a partial ordering, necessitating a serial search of sorts, so there is indeed some aspect

[4]There are perhaps many reasons for this, but one of the clearest is that it is far easier to perform controlled perception experiments.

of memory involving linear distance.[5] Summarizing previous work, McElree, Foraker, and Dyer (2003) posit that the content-addressable memory subsystem is complemented by one using serial search for "temporal order" and "position". Bornkessel-Schlesewsky and Schlesewsky (2013) distinguish between "time-dependent" and "time-independent" computations in language processing, i.e. commutative and non-commutative operations.

This complexities of addressing for storage and retrieval tie into a somewhat deeper issue regarding the nature of memory in language processing. Although newer memory models posit a feature-based recall system with falling activation, this does not mean that individual sentence entities are stored in the received form. Due to the incremental and predictive nature of language processing, it is quite possible that a form of partial evaluation takes place, e.g. combining separate noun and verb entities into one Action entity or combining a subject and an object into one Relation (e.g. Cause-Effect) entity (cf. *Actor* in Bornkessel-Schlesewsky and Schlesewsky 2009; Bornkessel and Schlesewsky 2006; but older notions of purely syntactic folding or "chunking" can be traced back to the Sausage Machine in Frazier and Fodor 1978 and classical parsing strategies like Minimal Attachment and Late Closure). In this vein, the distance to the head may be less relevant than distance to the next element in the relation, even when that element is a fellow dependent.

Consider for example a typical transitive construction in an SOV language — many aspects of the relationship between S and O will already be established at the SO position,[6] which means that the S may not need to be bound to the verb, but rather to its sister dependency O and that the distance between this conjoined dependency and its head verb is decisive. In this case, the summed distance from S to O and from O to V is more important than the summed SV and OV distances. Moreover, in some extreme cases, the strength of the prediction may be so strong that not all elements are fully processed, as seen for example in the Moses illusion (A. J. Sanford et al. 2010). Alday, Schlesewsky, and Bornkessel-Schlesewsky (2014) were able to model neurolinguistic data by implementing this type of relational processing via a form of weighted feature overlap for features prototypical to the roles in transitive relations. Even for a strictly dependency-length based model, such chunking may reduce the length of the dependency by folding the intervening elements together, which would violate the assumption of strict monotonicity (of the cost of a dependency as a function of its length that is at the basis of Ferrer-i-Cancho's argument).

In spite of the challenges presented above, Ferrer-i-Cancho's model is a step in the right direction. He presents a general yet rigorous explanation for both synchronic and diachronic tendencies in word order across languages and thus formalizes a long-standing intuition amongst more cognitively oriented linguists.

[5] Even in the idealized world of computer science, hash collisions can lead to linear search.

[6] Ferrer-i-Cancho references Lupyan and Christiansen in considering that case marking may facilitate the learning of SOV structures. This also fits quite well with incremental relational processing — case marking establishes the relationship between the nominal arguments even in the (temporary) absence of a verb (cf. Bornkessel-Schlesewsky and Schlesewsky 2009).

Moreover, he shows the importance in exploring the role of simple mechanisms in complex systems like language. However, like all such mathematical models, the simplicity and elegance come at a certain cost, namely obscuring many of the messy details of reality. Euclidean geometry is a good-enough approximation for many everyday phenomena but its ultimately flawed assumptions are insufficient for a truly deep understanding of our curved space-time. In much the same way, Ferrer-i-Cancho's model is a good starting point, especially for the big picture of diachronic change, but cannot be the last stop if we are to fully understand the cognitive mechanisms of word order.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank R. Ferrer-i-Cancho for the interesting discussion and essential feedback.

Bibliography

Alday, Phillip M., Matthias Schlesewsky, and Ina Bornkessel-Schlesewsky. 2014. "Towards a Computational Model of Actor-Based Language Comprehension." *Neuroinformatics* 12 (1): 143–179.

Bates, Elizabeth, Sandra McNew, Brian MacWhinney, Antonella Devescovi, and Stan Smith. 1982. "Functional Constraints on Sentence Processing: A Cross-Linguistic Study." *Cognition* 11: 245–299.

Bianchi, Valentina. "On Focus Movement in Italian." In *Information Structure and Agreement*, edited by M. V. Camacho-Taboada, A. Jiménez Fernández, and Reyes-Tejedor Martín-Gonzáles J. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bornkessel, Ina, and Matthias Schlesewsky. 2006. "The Extended Argument Dependency Model: A Neurocognitive Approach to Sentence Comprehension Across Languages." *Psychological Review* 113 (4): 787–821.

Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, Ina, and Matthias Schlesewsky. 2009. "The Role of Prominence Information in the Real-Time Comprehension of Transitive Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Approach." *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3 (1): 19–58.

———. 2013. "Reconciling Time, Space and Function: A New Dorsal-Ventral Stream Model of Sentence Comprehension." *Brain and Language* 125 (1): 60–76.

Dryer, Matthew S., and Martin Haspelmath, ed. 2013. *WALS Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. http://wals.info/.

Ferrer-i-Cancho, Ramon. in press. "The Placement of the Head That Minimizes Online Memory: a Complex Systems Approach." *Language Dynamics and Change*.

Frazier, Lyn, and Janet Dean Fodor. 1978. "The Sausage Machine: A New Two-Stage Parsing Model." *Cognition* 6 (4): 291–325.

Gibson, Edward. 1998. "Linguistic Complexity: Locality of Syntactic Dependencies." *Cognition* (Jan).

———. 2000. "The Dependency Locality Theory: A Distance-Based Theory of Linguistic Complexity." In *Image, Language, Brain*, edited by Y Miyashita, A Marantz, and O'NeilW, 95–126. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Haider, Hubert. 2009. "Linguistics – Postmodern Frippery or Primordial Cognitive Science?" *Presentation at the "Visions for Linguistics" Workshop*. Schloss Freudental 20–22 Nov. 2009: Universität Konstanz.

———. 2010. *The Syntax of German*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harbert, Wayne. 2007. *The Germanic Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jonides, J, R Lewis, D Nee, and C Lustig. 2008. "The Mind and Brain of Short-Term Memory." *Annual Reviews* (Jan).

Kehlmann, Daniel. 2007. *Die Vermessung Der Welt*. Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Konieczny, Lars. 2000. "Locality and Parsing Complexity." *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 29 (6): 627–645.

LaPolla, Randy J. 1993. "Arguments Against 'Subject' and 'Direct Object' as Viable Concepts in Chinese." *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 63 (4): 759–813.

Lewis, R, and S Vasishth. 2005. "An Activation-Based Model of Sentence Processing as Skilled Memory Retrieval." *Cognitive Science: A Multidisciplinary Journal* (Jan): 375–419.

Lewis, R, S Vasishth, and J Van Dyke. 2006. "Computational Principles of Working Memory in Sentence Comprehension." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 10 (10) (Jan): 447–454.

Lupyan, G., and M. H. Christiansen. "Case, Word Order, and Language Learnability: Insights from Connection Modeling." In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 591–601. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mallinson, Graham, and Barry J Blake. 1981. *Language Typology : cross-Linguistic Studies in Syntax*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishers.

McElree, Brian, Stephani Foraker, and Lisbeth Dyer. 2003. "Memory Structures That Subserve Sentence Comprehension." *Journal of Memory and Language* 48 (1): 67–91.

Sanford, Anthony J, Hartmut Leuthold, Jason Bohan, and Alison J S Sanford. 2010. "Anomalies at the Borderline of Awareness: An ERP Study." *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 23 (3): 514–523.